arXiv:1509.06170v1 [math.LO] 21 Sep 2015

REPRESENTATIONS OF $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-INVARIANT MEASURES: PART 1

NATHANAEL ACKERMAN

Abstract. In this paper we generalize the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem concerning representations of distributions of exchangeable arrays via collections of measurable maps. We give criteria when such a representation theorem exists for arrays which need only be preserved by a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$. Specifically, for a countable structure $\mathcal{M}$ we introduce the notion of an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-*recipe*, which is an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant array obtained via a collection of measurable functions indexed by the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-orbits in $\mathcal{M}$. We further introduce the notion of a *free structure* and then show that if $\mathcal{M}$ is free then every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure on an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space is the distribution of an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-recipe. We also show that if a measure is the distribution of an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-recipe it must be the restriction of a measure on a free structure.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Notation 3
2. Background 4
2.1. Polish Group Actions 4
2.2. Infinitary Logic 6
2.3. Definable Expansions 9
2.4. Invariant Measures 12
2.5. Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg 13
2.6. Existence of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-Invariant Measure 15
3. Canonical Structures 15
3.1. Canonical Structures 15
3.2. Free Structures 17
4. Merging of Measures 21
4.1. Consequences 25
5. Representations 26
5.1. $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-Recipes 26
5.2. Representability and Free Structures 27
6. Acknowledgements 29
References 29

1. Introduction

For a standard Borel space S, a sequence of S-valued random variables $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to be *exchangeable* if its distribution is unchanged by permutations of $\mathbb{N}$, i.e. if for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$

$$(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \overset{d}{=} (X_{\sigma(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}.$$

A natural class of exchangeable sequences are those of the which are of the form $(f(\zeta_\emptyset, \zeta_n))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ where $f\colon [0,1]^2 \to S$ is any measurable function and $\{\zeta_\emptyset\} \cup \{\zeta_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a collection of uniform identically distributed and independent (i.i.d.) $[0,1]$-valued random variables. An important result of de Finetti, Hewett and Savage is that all exchangeable sequences have a distribution which is of this form. This result is what is known as *de Finetti's theorem*.

Let $\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ be the collection of injective functions from a natural number into $\mathbb{N}$ and let $\mathfrak{P}(\cdot)$ be the powerset operation. For a standard Borel space S, an array of S-valued random variables $(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ is said to be *(jointly) exchangeable* if its distribution is unchanged under permutations of $\mathbb{N}$, i.e. if for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$

$$(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \overset{d}{=} (X_{\sigma(\overline{a})})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $f_n\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to S$ and let $(\zeta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ be a collection of uniform i.i.d. $[0,1]$-valued random variables. For $\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ let $\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}} = (\zeta_{\overline{b}})_{\overline{b}\in\mathfrak{P}(\overline{a})}$. A natural class of exchangeable arrays are those of the form $(f_{|\overline{a}|}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$. An important result of Aldous, Hoover and Kallenberg is that every exchangeable array is equivalent in distribution to one of the above form. This can be seen as a higher dimensional version of de Finetti's theorem, and is what is known as the *Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg* theorem.

Note that in the case of de Finetti's theorem as well as the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem, we only pinned down the random sequences or arrays up to having equal distribution. It therefore makes sense to instead consider the measure associated with such a distribution. We call such a measure $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-invariant as it is preserved by all elements of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$.

In this paper we will be interested in the distribution of arrays which, instead of being preserved under all elements of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$, only need to be preserved under elements of a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$. It is well know that every closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ is the automorphism group of a countable structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$. Now if $\mathcal{M}$ is such a structure there is a natural collection of arrays whose distribution is preserved under all elements of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$. Specifically for $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{M}$ let $p_{\overline{a}}$ be the orbit of $\overline{a}$ under $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ and let $f_{p_{\overline{a}}}\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to S$ be a measurable function. It is easy to see that the array $(f_{p_{\overline{a}}}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant.

We are interested in identifying when an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure is the distribution of an array of the above form. In particular we will show that to every structure $\mathcal{M}$ there is an extension to a *free* structure $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ such that any $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure is the distribution of such array if and only if it has an extension to an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$-invariant measure (in a sense we we will make precise).

1.1. **Notation.** For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we use n to denote both the natural number as well as the von Neumann ordinal $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$. We will use $\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ to denote the collection of finite sequences of distinct natural numbers.

We let $\mathfrak{P}(X)$ denote the collection of all subsets of X. For $n \leq \omega$ and $\boxdot \in \{=, <, \leq\}$ we let $\mathfrak{P}_{\boxdot n}(X)$ be the collection of subsets of X which have cardinality $\boxdot n$. For $\mathbf{k} = (k_0, \dots, k_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ and $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathfrak{P}(d)$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ we let $k \circ I = \{k_{i_1}, \dots, k_{i_m}\}$. Similarly for $K = \{k_0, \dots, k_{d-1}\} \in \mathfrak{P}_d(\mathbb{N})$ with $k_0 < \cdots < k_{d-1}$ and $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \in \mathfrak{P}(d)$ with $i_1 < \cdots < i_m$ we let $K \circ I = \{k_{i_1}, \dots, k_{i_m}\}$. If $(E_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ is an indexed collection of objects and $\overline{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ we let $\hat{E}_{\overline{b}} := \langle E_{\overline{b} \circ I} \rangle_{I \in \mathfrak{P}(|\overline{b}|)}$ and if $B \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})$ we let $\hat{E}_B := \langle E_{B \circ I} \rangle_{I \in \mathfrak{P}(|\overline{b}|)}$.

If $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on a set X and $x \in X$ let $[x]_{\equiv} := \{y \in X \colon x \equiv y\}$, i.e. $[x]_{\equiv}$ is the $\equiv$-equivalence class of x. If A, B are sets we let $A \triangle B$ be the symmetric difference of A and B, i.e. $A \triangle B = A \setminus B \cup B \setminus A$.

All languages will be countable and relational. Note by a standard interpretation of functions by their graphs, restricting to relational languages yields no loss of generality. Further L and its variants will always represent languages. If R is a relation we let $\mathrm{ar}(R)$ be its arity. Let L^n be the sub-language of L consisting of those relations of arity exactly n and $\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}$ be the sublanguage of L consisting of those relations of arity at most n. We let $\mathcal{L}_{\omega,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ be the collection of first order formulas in the language L and we let $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ be the collection of infinitary formulas in the language L. Unless otherwise stated all formulas will be in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ for some language L. For a formula φ, and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we let $\neg^i \varphi$ stand for $\neg\varphi$ if i is odd and φ if i is even.

$\mathcal{M}$ and its variants will always be structures for some language and we will use $\mathcal{M}$ for both the structure and the underlying set when no confusion can arise. We will use $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ to denote the language of $\mathcal{M}$. When $\overline{a}$ is a tuple of elements from $\mathcal{M}$ we will abuse notation and write $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{M}$ to denote $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{M}^{|\overline{a}|}$.

Suppose $\overline{x} = \langle x_i \rangle_{i \in n}$ where $n \leq \omega$. We define a function $\gamma_{\overline{x}} \colon [0,1] \to \overline{x}$ as follows. First $\gamma_{\overline{x}}(1) := x_0$. If $n < \omega$ and $y \in [0,1)$ then $\gamma_{\overline{x}}(y) := x_i$ if and only if $y \in [\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n})$. If $n = \omega$ and $y \in [0,1)$ then $\gamma_{\overline{x}}(y) := x_i$ if and only if $y \in [1 - 2^{-i}, 1 - 2^{-(i+1)})$.

If $\Upsilon = (\zeta_i)_{i \in I}$ is a collection of $[0,1]$-valued random variables we say Υ is a $U[0,1]$**-array** if $(\zeta_i)_{i \in I}$ consists of i.i.d. random variables with uniform

distribution. We let λ be the Lebesgue measure. For random variables X, Y taking values in the same space we let $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ denote the fact that X and Y have the same distribution. We will use "a. s." to denote the phrase "almost surely". If S is a Borel space we let $\mathcal{P}_1(S)$ be the collection of probability measures on S. All measures in this paper will be probability measures and all spaces will be standard Borel spaces.

We denote by $\mathfrak{S}_X$ the collection of permutations of X. We will consider $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ as a Polish group with the subspace topology inherited from $\mathbb{N}^\mathbb{N}$. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an L-structure we denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ the collection of automorphisms of $\mathcal{M}$.

For any notions of probability theory not explicitly covered here we refer the reader to [Kal02]. For any notions of model theory not covered here we refer the reader to [Bar75]. For any notions of descriptive set theory we refer the reader to [Kec95] or [BK96].

2. Background

In this section we recall some important facts and results which will be used later.

2.1. **Polish Group Actions.** Suppose G is a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$. For $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ let $\overline{a} \sim_G \overline{b}$ if there is a $g \in G$ such that $\overline{a} = g(\overline{b})$. It is immediate that $\sim_G$ is an equivalence relation on $\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ in which $\sim_G$-equivalent tuples have the same length.

Let $\mathrm{L}_G := \{R_{[\overline{a}]_{\sim_G}}(\overline{x})\}_{\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ where $\mathrm{ar}(R_{[\overline{a}]_{\sim_G}}) = |\overline{a}|$. We call L_G the **canonical language** of G. Now let $\mathcal{M}_G$ be the L_G-structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{M}_G \models R_A(\overline{b})$ if and only if $\overline{b} \in A$. We call $\mathcal{M}_G$ the **canonical structure** of G. The following two lemmas are then immediate.

Lemma 2.1 ([BK96] Sec. 1.5)**.** *If G is any closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ then*

- $G = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_G)$.
- *$\mathcal{M}_G$ is the canonical structure of* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_G)$.
- *$\mathcal{M}_G$ is ultrahomogeneous, i.e. any isomorphism between finite structures extends to an automorphism.*

Lemma 2.2. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is a structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ then* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ *is a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$.*

In particular for the purposes of studying closed subgroups of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ it suffices to restrict our attention to groups of the form $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ where $\mathcal{M}$ is the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-canonical structure. This is significant because there is a concrete representation of actions of G for G a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ in terms of its canonical structure.

Definition 2.3. Suppose G is a Polish group. A **G-space** is a pair $(\circ_X, X)$ where

- X is a Borel space.
- $\circ\colon G \times X \to X$ is a Borel map.

A function $i\colon (\circ_X, X) \to (\circ_Y, Y)$ is a map of G-spaces if it is a Borel function such that $(\forall g \in G)(\forall x \in X)\ i(\circ_X(g,x)) = \circ_Y(g, i(x))$.

If $(\circ_X, X)$ is a G-space then we extend the action of G to subsets of X where, for $A \subseteq X$ and $g \in G$, $gA := \{\circ_X(g,a)\colon a \in A\}$.

Definition 2.4. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is an $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$-structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ and suppose L is a countable language disjoint from $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$. We define $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$ to be the collection of $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L}$ structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ such that whenever $\mathcal{N} \in \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$ then $\mathcal{N}|_{\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M}$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (possibly 0), $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L})$ and $n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$[\![\varphi(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1})]\!]_\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{N} \in \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})\colon \mathcal{N} \models \varphi(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1})\}.$$

We give $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$ the topology generated by the clopen subbasis

$$\{[\![R(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1})]\!]_\mathcal{M}\colon R \in \mathrm{L}, \mathrm{ar}(R) = k, n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

When $\mathcal{M}_\emptyset$ is the unique structure in the empty language we will denote $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M}_\emptyset)$ by $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}$. In this case observe that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_\emptyset) = \mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$.

Now for any $\mathcal{M}$, there is a natural action of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$ on $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$.

Definition 2.5. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$-structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ and L is a language disjoint from $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$. We define the action $\circ_\mathcal{M}\colon \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) \times \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$ where, for $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathcal{N} \in \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$, $\circ_\mathcal{M}(g, \mathcal{N})$ is the structure $g\mathcal{N}$ such for all $R \in \mathrm{L}$ of arity k and $n_0, \dots, n_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$

$$g\mathcal{N} \models R(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}) \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{N} \models R(g^{-1}(n_0), \dots, g^{-1}(n_{k-1}))$$

It is immediate that $(\circ_\mathcal{M}, \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M}))$ is a Polish $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$-structure with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ and L is a language disjoint from $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$. Further suppose L has relations of unbounded arity. Then $(\circ_\mathcal{M}, \mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M}))$ is a universal $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space, i.e. an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space which contains an isomorphic copy of every other $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space as a subspace.*

Proof. [BK96] Thm. 2.7.4. □

In particular Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.6 tell us that if G is a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$ then the study of G-invariant measures on G-spaces is equivalent to the study of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measures on $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$. This is significant as it allows us to translate the problem from the realm of descriptive set theory to the realm of model theory and hence to use all the tools of model theory which are available to us.

Definition 2.7. We say $A \subseteq \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$**-invariant** if for all $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$, $gA = A$.

It is immediate that if $\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$ then $[\![\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant Borel subset of $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ and hence $[\![\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ inherits the structure of an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space.

Definition 2.8. We say a sentence $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$**-universal** if $[\![T]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a universal $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-space.

We will often want to assume our models satisfy some basic syntactic properties, e.g. non-redundancy of relations, quantifier elimination for a fragment, etc. and provided we can find a universal theory whose models are exactly those with the desired syntactic properties there assuming our structures satisfy those properties results in no loss in generality. We will come back to this in Section 2.3.

2.2. **Infinitary Logic.** In this section we recall some basic facts and definitions from infinitary logic. In particular it will be important in what follows to pin down various notions of quantifier free type. First we recall some basic properties of structures.

Lemma 2.9 ([Bar75] Ch. VII.6)**.** *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a countable $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$-structure. Then there is a sentence $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}})$ such that for each a countable $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$-structure $\mathcal{N}$*

$$\mathcal{N} \models \sigma_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{N}.$$

We will often want to focus on structures $\mathcal{M}$ which are, in some sense, far from being rigid (and hence will have a large automorphism group). One way to express this is by saying the structure has trivial definable closure.

Definition 2.10. For $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{M}$ we say the **definable closure** of $\overline{a}$ is the set

$$\mathrm{dcl}(\overline{a}) := \{b \in \mathcal{M} \colon (\forall g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}))\ g(\overline{a}) = \overline{a} \to g(b) = b\}.$$

We say $\mathcal{M}$ has **trivial definable closure**, or **trivial dcl**, if

$$(\forall \overline{a} \in \mathcal{M})\ \ \mathrm{dcl}(\overline{a}) = \overline{a}.$$

Definition 2.11. A **fragment** is a subset of $A \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ which is closed under

- Sub-formulas
- $\wedge, \vee, \neg$
- $(\exists x), (\forall x)$.

Definition 2.12. We say a sentence $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ has **quantifier elimination** over a fragment A if for all $\varphi(\overline{x}) \in A$ there is a relation $R_\varphi(\overline{x}) \in \mathrm{L}$ such that $T \models (\forall \overline{x})\varphi(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow R_\varphi(\overline{x})$.

We now introduce some important notions involving quantifier free types.

Definition 2.13. A **partial quantifier free** L**-type on** $(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is a collection of formula, q, such that whenever $\eta(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}) \in q$ we have

- $\{x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}\} \subseteq \{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$,
- η is either an atomic formula or the negation of an atomic formula,
- for all $0 \leq i < j < k$, $x_i \neq x_j \in q$,
- There is an L-structure $\mathcal{M}$ and a tuple $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \bigwedge\{\eta(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_{k-1}})\colon \eta(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}}) \in q\}$.

We say a partial quantifier free type is a **quantifier free type** if it is maximal under inclusion.

For $\mathcal{M}$ an $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$-structure and $\overline{a} \in \mathcal{M}$ we say $\overline{a}$ **realizes** a quantifier free type $p(\overline{x})$ if $\mathcal{M} \models \bigwedge_{\eta(\overline{x}) \in p(\overline{x})} \eta(\overline{a})$. We denote the collection of quantifier free types realized by elements of $\mathcal{M}$ by $\mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$.

Throughout this paper we will be interested in constructing random structures in stages, first determining the structure of all singletons, then determining, based on the structure of the singletons, the structure of the pairs, etc. When doing this it is important that the complete structure of all n-tuples is determined before we determine the structure of the $(n+1)$-tuples. For this reason we will want to restrict our attention to the case where any n-ary relation which holds must have distinct elements (as otherwise it would be about a k-tuple of distinct elements for some $k < n$ and not about an n-tuple of distinct elements). To this end we define an important class of quantifier free types.

Definition 2.14. Suppose $\eta(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ is an atomic formula. We say $\eta(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1})$ is **non-redundant** if for all $0 \leq i < j < k$ we have $x_i \neq x_j$. We say a partial quantifier free type is **non-redundant** if every atomic formula in it, except perhaps those of the form $x_i = x_i$, are non-redundant.

For $\overline{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ distinct elements let $\mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ be the collection of non-redundant quantifier free types on $\overline{x}$ in L. We will omit L when it is clear from context.

Note $\mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ has a natural topology generated by clopen sets of the from $\{q\colon \neg^{\ell} R(x_{i_0}, \dots, x_{i_{j-1}}) \in q\}$ where $R \in \mathrm{L}$ and $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$. This topology makes $\mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ homeomorphic to Cantor space.

Definition 2.15. We say a theory $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ has **non-redundant quantifier free types** if for any relation $R \in \mathrm{L}$ of arity k,

$$T \models (\forall x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) \left(R(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}) \to \bigwedge_{0 \leq i < j < k} x_i \neq x_j \right).$$

We say a structure $\mathcal{M}$ is **non-redundant** if $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ has non-redundant quantifier free types.

In particular if T has non-redundant quantifier free types, then every quantifier free type realized in a model of T is non-redundant.

Example 2.16. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a canonical structure. Then $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ has non-redundant quantifier free types.

Another important class of partial quantifier free types are those where the ordering of the variables in the formulas is consistent.

Definition 2.17. We say a partial quantifier free type q on distinct elements $(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ is **ordered** if whenever $\eta(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}}) \in q$ and $0 \leq j^- < j^+ < k$ we have $i_{j^-} < i_{j^+}$.

We define an **ordered quantifier free type** to be a maximal ordered partial quantifier free type under inclusion (among the collection of ordered quantifier free types on the same variables).

For $\overline{x} = (x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ let $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ be the collection of ordered quantifier free types in L on $\overline{x}$. Note $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ has a natural topology generated by clopen sets of the from $\{q\colon \neg^{\ell} R(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{j-1}}) \in q\}$ where $R \in \mathrm{L}$, $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$ and $0 \leq i_0 < \ldots, < i_{j-1} < n$. This topology makes $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ homeomorphic to Cantor space.

Note that an ordered quantifier free type is not itself a quantifier free type as we can find an extension which doesn't preserve the order of variables.

The relationship between non-redundant and ordered quantifier free types is the following straightforward lemma.

Lemma 2.18. *For any $q \in \mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ there is a unique collection $\langle p_\tau \rangle_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{\overline{x}}}$ such that*

- $p_\tau \in \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\tau(\overline{x}))$,
- $q = \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{\overline{x}}} p_\tau$.

The Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem gives representation of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant, S-valued arrays. In the process of studying the distribution of Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant arrays we want to move away from the situation where the arrays are S-valued to the situation where we are looking at distributions on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ which take values in non-redundant structures (when $\mathcal{M}$ is a canonical structure).

In order to do this we will want to consider arrays $\langle f_p \rangle_{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})}$ where f_p, instead of taking values in S, takes values in $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(\overline{x})$ where $|\overline{x}| = \mathrm{ar}(p)$ (which is itself a Borel space). In this way we will be able to use Lemma 2.18 to recover the (non-redundant) quantifier free type of a tuple $(n_0, \ldots, n_{k-1})$ from

the values of $\langle f_{p_\tau}(\overline{x})\rangle_{\tau\in\mathfrak{S}_k}$ when $\mathcal{M}\models p_\tau(\tau(n_0),\dots,\tau(n_{k-1}))$. We will then be able to recover an element of $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ from $\langle f_p(\overline{x})\rangle_{p\in\mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})}$.

We will end this section recalling the notion of deduction in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ (see for example [Bar75] Sec. III.4). This will be important when discussing the theory of an ergodic invariant measure.

Definition 2.19. We say $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ is a **tautology** if for all L-structures $\mathcal{M}$, we have $\mathcal{M}\models\varphi$.

Suppose $T\subseteq\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ is a collection of sentences. We define the **deductive closure** of T, $\mathrm{dc}(T)$, to be the smallest subset of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ such that

- $T\subseteq\mathrm{dc}(T)$.
- (Tautologies) $\mathrm{dc}(T)$ contains all tautologies.
- (Modus Ponens) If $\varphi\in\mathrm{dc}(T)$ and $(\varphi\to\psi)\in\mathrm{dc}(T)$ then $\psi\in\mathrm{dc}(T)$.
- (Generalization) If $(\forall v)(\varphi\to\psi(v))\in T$ and v is not free in φ, then $(\varphi\to(\forall v)\psi(V))\in T$.
- (Conjunction) If $\bigwedge\Phi\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ and for all $\varphi\in\Phi$, $(\psi\to\varphi)\in\mathrm{dc}(T)$ then $(\psi\to\bigwedge\Phi)\in T$.

We say T is **consistent** if $\mathrm{dc}(T)\neq\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$.

Note while it is the case that if T is countable and consistent it must have a model, this is not in general the case for uncountable T.

2.3. **Definable Expansions.** In this section we review the notion of a definable expansion and show how they can be used to find Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-universal sentences with desired properties.

Definition 2.20. Suppose $\mathrm{L}_0\subseteq\mathrm{L}_1$, $T_0\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_0)$ and $T_1\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$. We say that T_1 is a **definable expansion** of T_0 if

- Every L_0-structure $\mathcal{M}_0$ satisfying T_0 has a unique expansion to an L_1-structure $\mathcal{M}_1$ satisfying T_1.
- $T_1\models T_0$.
- For every formula $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$ there is a formula $\varphi_0\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_0)$ such that
$$T_1\models(\forall\overline{x})\ \varphi(\overline{x})\leftrightarrow\varphi_0(\overline{x}).$$

So T_1 is a definable expansion of T_0 if all models of T_1 are also models of T_0, the restriction relation is a bijection, and further every formula in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$ is equivalent (over T_1) to one in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_0)$. The following lemma is then straightforward.

Lemma 2.21. *Suppose*

- $\mathrm{L}_0\subseteq\mathrm{L}_1$,
- $T_0\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_0)$ *and* $T_1\in\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$,
- $T_0\models\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$,

- T_1 *is a definable expansion of* T_0.

Then for any $T^* \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_0)$, $[\![T_0 \wedge T^*]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ *is isomorphic to* $[\![T_1 \wedge T^*]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ *as* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$*-spaces.*

Lemma 2.21 tells us that if T_1 is a definable expansion of T_0 then when considered as $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-spaces, $[\![T_0]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ is isomorphic to $[\![T_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$. We will in particular be interested in when two theories have a common definable expansion.

Definition 2.22. Suppose $\mathrm{L}_0 \cap \mathrm{L}_1 = \emptyset$. We say theories $T_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$ and $T_1 \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_1)$ are **interdefinable** when there is a language $\mathrm{L}_2 \supseteq \mathrm{L}_0 \cup \mathrm{L}_1$ and a theory T_2 which is a definable expansion of both T_0 and T_1.

So two theories are interdefinable when it is possible to define each from the other (possibly in some larger language).

Example 2.23. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is an L-structure and $\mathcal{M}_{can}$ is the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-canonical structure. Then $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}_{can}}$ are interdefinable.

Another important class of examples of interdefinable structures are those obtained by simply relabeling the relations.

Definition 2.24. A **relabeling** of a language L_0 by L_1 is a bijection $i\colon \mathrm{L}_0 \to \mathrm{L}_1$ such that for any relation $R \in \mathrm{L}_0$, $\mathrm{ar}(R) = \mathrm{ar}(i(R))$. Note any relabeling extends to a bijection $i\colon \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathcal{L}_0) \to \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathcal{L}_1)$.

Example 2.25. If $i\colon \mathrm{L}_0 \to \mathrm{L}_1$ is a relabeling then the empty language in L_0 is interdefinable with the empty language in L_1.

There is an important example of a theory which is interdefinable with the empty theory in a language.

For a language L let

$$\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}} := \bigwedge_{\substack{R\in\mathrm{L}\\ \mathrm{ar}(R)=k}} (\forall x_0,\dots,x_{k-1}) \left(R(x_0,\dots,x_{k-1}) \to \bigwedge_{0\le i<j<k} x_i \neq x_j \right).$$

For a language L let $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}} := \{R_{P,\equiv}\colon P \in \mathrm{L}$, of arity n, $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on n with $\mathrm{ar}(R_{P,\equiv})$ many equivalence class$\}$ (here $\mathfrak{nr}$ stands for "non-redundant").

Let $\mathrm{Th}^{\mathfrak{nr}}_{\mathrm{L}}$ be the conjunction of all sentences of the form

$$(\forall x_0,\dots,x_{n-1})\ R_{P,\equiv}(x_{i_0},\dots,x_{i_{k-1}}) \leftrightarrow \Bigg[P(x_0,\dots,x_{n-1}) \wedge \bigwedge_{0\le j<\ell<k} x_{i_j} \neq x_{i_\ell} \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{0\le j<\ell<n\\ j\equiv\ell}} x_j = x_\ell \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{0\le j<\ell<n\\ \neg(j\equiv\ell)}} x_j \neq x_\ell \Bigg]$$

The following proposition is immediate from the definitions of $\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ and $\mathrm{Th}^{\mathfrak{nr}}_{\mathrm{L}}$.

Proposition 2.26. *If* L *is a language then*

(a) $\omega \cdot |\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}| = \omega \cdot |\mathrm{L}|$.
(b) $Th_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}} \wedge \mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ *is a definable expansion of the empty theory in* L *and* $\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ *in* $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}$.
(c) $\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ *has non-redundant quantifier free types.*

Proposition 2.26 (b) says that $\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ is interdefinable with the empty theory in L. And, as L has unbounded arity if and only if $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}$ does, $\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}$ is Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-universal precisely when $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ is a universal Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-space. We will prefer in most circumstances to work with $[\![\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ rather than with $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ and as such we define $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M}) := [\![\mathscr{T}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{nr}}}]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$.

We now give a definable expansion which will gives us quantifier elimination over a fragment.

Given a countable fragment A we let $\mathrm{L}_A := \{R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})\colon \varphi(\overline{x}) \in A\}$.

We now define the sentence $\mathrm{Th}^{qe}_A \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_A)$ to be the conjunction of the following:

- If $\varphi(\overline{x}) = \neg\psi(\overline{x})$ then $(\forall\overline{x})R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow \neg R_{\psi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})$.
- If $\varphi(\overline{x}) = \bigwedge_{i\in I}\psi_i(\overline{x})$ then $(\forall\overline{x})R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{i\in I} R_{\psi_i(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})$.
- If $\varphi(\overline{x}) = \bigvee_{i\in I}\psi_i(\overline{x})$ then $(\forall\overline{x})R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i\in I} R_{\psi_i(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})$.
- If $\varphi(\overline{x}) = (\exists y)\psi(\overline{x}, y)$ then $(\forall\overline{x})R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow (\exists y)R_{\psi(\overline{x},y)}(\overline{x}, y)$.
- If $\varphi(\overline{x}) = (\forall y)\psi(\overline{x}, y)$ then $(\forall\overline{x})R_{\varphi(\overline{x})}(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow (\forall y)R_{\psi(\overline{x},y)}(\overline{x}, y)$.

Let $\mathrm{Th}^*_A := \bigwedge_{P\in\mathrm{L}}(\forall\overline{x})P(\overline{x}) \leftrightarrow R_{P(\overline{x})}(\overline{x})$.

We call $\mathrm{Th}^{qe}_A \wedge \mathrm{Th}^*_A$ the **Morleyization** of A.

The following is immediate.

Proposition 2.27. *If* L *is a language and* A *is a countable fragment of* $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ *then*

(a) $|\mathrm{L}_A| = \omega$.
(b) $Th_A \wedge Th^*_A$ *is a definable expansion of the empty theory in* L *and* Th_A *in* L_A. *Hence* Th_A *is interdefinable with the empty theory in* L, *and if* L *has unbounded arity* Th_A *is* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-universal.*
(c) $Th_A \wedge Th^*_A$ *has quantifier elimination for formulas in* A.

It is worth noting that in general Th_A will not have non-redundant quantifier free types. However, if we wish to obtain a universal Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-theory which both admits elimination of quantifiers for A and has non-redundant quantifier free types, we can first apply the above to get the theory Th_A and then apply the transformation to get an interdefinable non-redundant theory. This will result in a universal Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-theory which has quantifier elimination for A as well as non-redundant quantifier free types.

2.4. **Invariant Measures.** We now introduce the main objects of study in this paper, Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant probability measures. In this subsection G will be a Polish group and $(\circ, X)$ will be a G-space.

Definition 2.28. Suppose μ is a measure on X. We say μ is **G-invariant** if for all Borel sets $B \subseteq X$ and all $g \in G$

$$\mu(B) = \mu(gB).$$

An important class of invariant measures are the ergodic ones.

Definition 2.29. Suppose $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(X)$. We say a Borel subset $B \subseteq X$ is **μ-a. s. G-invariant** if for every $g \in G$, $\mu(B \triangle g^{-1}B) = 0$. We say μ is **ergodic** if for every μ-a. s. G-invariant Borel set B, either $\mu(B) = 0$ or $\mu(B) = 1$.

From the model theoretic point of view one of the most important consequences of ergodicity is that to each ergodic Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ we can associate a complete consistent $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$-theory.

Definition 2.30. Suppose $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M}))$. Define the **almost sure theory of** μ to be

$$\mathrm{Th}(\mu) := \{\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}) \colon \mu([\![\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) = 1\}.$$

Lemma 2.31. *For any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M}))$, Th($\mu$) is consistent.*

Proof. By σ-additivity of the measure μ we have $\mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ must be closed under the rules of deduction of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ in Definition 2.19, i.e. we must have $\mathrm{Th}(\mu) = \mathrm{dc}(\mathrm{Th}(\mu))$. However $\mu([\![(\exists x)\ x \neq x]\!]) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0 \neq 1$ and so $\mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ is consistent. □

For our purposes we are most interested in the theory of a measure when the measure is ergodic.

Lemma 2.32. *If $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_1(\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M}))$ is ergodic and* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-invariant then Th(μ) is complete and consistent.*

Proof. For any sentence $\tau \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L})$ we have that $[\![\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $[\![\neg\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}$ are invariant and hence $\mu([\![\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\mu([\![\neg\tau]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) \in \{0, 1\}$. Therefore one of τ or $\neg\tau$ is in $\mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ and so $\mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ is complete.

The consistency of $\mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ follows from Lemma 2.31. □

We will end this section with a simple but important criteria for when a function can be extended to an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$.

Definition 2.33. For any language L let $\mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$ be the collection of formulas which are finite conjunctions of atomic and negations of atomic formulas with parameters in $\mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.34. *Suppose* $\mu^- : \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L}) \to [0,1]$ *is such that*

(a) *For every* $\zeta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M})$, *if* $\mathcal{M} \models \eta$ *then* $\mu^-(\eta) = 1$.
(b) *For every* $\zeta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L})$ *and every atomic* $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L}$*-formula* η *with parameters from* $\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mu^-(\zeta) = \mu^-(\zeta \wedge \eta) + \mu^-(\zeta \wedge \neg\eta).$$

Then there is a unique measure μ *on* $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$ *such that* $\mu([\![\eta]\!]_\mathcal{M}) = \mu^-(\eta)$ *for all* $\eta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L})$.

Further if $\mu^-(\zeta(\overline{a})) = \mu^-(\zeta(\overline{b}))$ *whenever* $\overline{a}, \overline{b}$ *are in the same* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$*-orbit then* μ *is* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$*-invariant.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the Carathéodory extension theorem. □

2.5. **Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg.** In this section we recall the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem. This theorem gives a representation for $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-invariant measures. When $\mathcal{M}$ is free, a notion we will define in Definition 3.5, we will be able to combine an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure μ with an explicit $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-invariant measure $\nu_\mathcal{M}$ concentrated on $[\![\sigma_\mathcal{M}]\!]$ to get a $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-invariant measure. We will then use the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem to get a representation of this combined measure from which we will be able to extract a representation of μ.

Before we state the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem we will want some notation (see for example [Kal05] Ch. 7.1).

We call $(\eta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ an $\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$**-array of functions** (from X to Y) if for all $\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$, $\eta_{\overline{a}}$ is a function from $X^{\mathfrak{P}(|\overline{a}|)}$ to Y. Similarly we call $(\beta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ a $\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})$**-array of functions** (from X to Y) if for all $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})$, $\beta_{\overline{a}}$ is a function from $X^{\mathfrak{P}(|\overline{a}|)}$ to Y.

If $(\zeta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ is a collection of functions where for each $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})$, $\zeta_{\overline{a}}$ is a function from Z to X then we say it is a **flat array** from Z to X.

Suppose $\Gamma = (\eta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ is a $\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$-array of functions from X to Y, $\Lambda = (\beta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ is a $\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})$-array of functions from X to Y and $\Upsilon = (\zeta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ is a flat array from Z to X. We define

$$\Lambda \circ \Upsilon = (\beta_{\overline{a}}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$$

and

$$\Gamma \circ \Upsilon = (\eta_{\overline{a}}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a} \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}.$$

Note that $\Lambda \circ \Upsilon$ is a flat array from Z to Y.

The following theorem is (a variant of) what is often referred to as the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem. See for example [Kal05] Ch. 7.5 or [Aus08].

Recall that a $U[0,1]$-array is a collection of uniform i.i.d. $[0,1]$-valued random variables.

Theorem 2.35. *Let S be a standard Borel space and let $\mathcal{X} = (X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ be a collection of S-valued random variables. Then the following are equivalent*

- *For all $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$, $(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \overset{d}{=} (X_{\tau(\overline{a})})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$, i.e. $(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ is* **exchangeable**.
- *There exists a $U[0,1]$-array $(\zeta_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ and a collection of measurable functions $f_n\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to S$ such that*

$$(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \overset{d}{=} (f_{|\overline{a}|}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \text{ a. s.}$$

Notice that as all Borel spaces of the same cardinality are isomorphic, for any collection $\langle S_n\rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Borel spaces, instead of having $X_{\overline{a}}$ be an S-valued random variable we could have allowed it to have been an $S_{|\overline{a}|}$-valued random variable without loss of generality. In particular, by allowing $X_{\overline{a}}$ to take values in $\mathrm{otp}(\mathrm{L}^{|\overline{a}|})$ for some language L we can assume the array $(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ collectively takes values in $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}$. This then gives us the following equivalent formulation of Theorem 2.35.

Definition 2.36. Define an **$\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe** to consist of a collection of measurable functions $f_n\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(x_0,\dots,x_{n-1})$ (for $n\in\mathbb{N}$).

If $\overline{f} = \langle f_n\rangle_{n\in\omega}$ is an $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe then we let $\mathscr{M}(\overline{f})\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})} \to \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}$ be the function such that

- for all relation $R\in\mathrm{L}$ of arity k,
- for all $\overline{y} = \langle y_{\overline{b}}\rangle_{\overline{b}\in\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})} \in [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$, and
- for all $\overline{a} = (a_0,\dots,a_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$

$\mathscr{M}(\overline{f})(\overline{y}) \models R(a_0,\dots,a_{k-1})$ if and only if $R(x_0,\dots,x_{k-1}) \in f_{|\overline{a}|}(\hat{y}_{\overline{a}})$

Proposition 2.37. *Suppose μ is a measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}$. Then the following are equivalent*

- *μ is $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant.*
- *There exists a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe $\overline{f}$ such that μ is the distribution of $\mathscr{M}(\overline{f})$ (where $[0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<}(\mathbb{N})}$ is given the Lebesgue measure).*

Proof. Suppose S is a standard Borel space and $i_n\colon S \to \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}}(x_0,\dots,x_{n-1})$ is a Borel bijection. We can therefore find an S-valued array $(X_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ such that $(i_{|\overline{a}|}(X_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$ has the same distribution as μ. The result then follows from Theorem 2.35. □

Also often considered part of the Aldous-Hoover-Kallenberg theorem is a characterization of when two exchangeable arrays have the same distribution. First though we need a definition.

Definition 2.38. Suppose $g\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to [0,1]$. We say g **preserves λ in the highest order arguments** if for each $\langle x_{\overline{a}}\rangle_{\overline{a}\in\mathfrak{P}(n)\setminus\{\{0,\dots,n-1\}\}}$ the map $x_{\{0,\dots,n-1\}} \to g(\langle x_{\overline{a}}\rangle_{\overline{a}\in\mathfrak{P}(n)})$ preserves λ.

Theorem 2.39 ([Kal05] Thm. 7.28)**.** *Suppose $\overline{f}^0 = \langle f^0_n\rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\overline{f}^1 = \langle f^1_n\rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-recipes and $\Upsilon = (\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}})_{\overline{a}\in\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ is a $U[0,1]$-array. Then the following are equivalent*

- $(f^0_{|\overline{a}|}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \overset{d}{=} (f^1_{|\overline{a}|}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}}))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}}$.
- *For each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ there are functions $g^0_n, g^1_n\colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to [0,1]$ which preserve λ in the highest order arguments and are such that*

$$(f^0_{|\overline{a}|}(\widehat{g^0_{|\overline{a}|}}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}})))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} = (f^1_{|\overline{a}|}(\widehat{g^1_{|\overline{a}|}}(\hat{\zeta}_{\overline{a}})))_{\overline{a}\in\mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}} \text{ a. s.}$$

2.6. **Existence of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-Invariant Measure.** The following is an important component for our classification in Proposition 4.5 of those structures $\mathcal{N}$ for which there is an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_\mathcal{N}]\!]_\mathcal{M}$.

Theorem 2.40 ([AFP] Thm. 1.1)**.** *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a* L*-structure. Then the following are equivalent*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl.*
- *There is an $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$-invariant measure $\mu_\mathcal{M}$ on $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}$ concentrated on $[\![\sigma_\mathcal{M}]\!]$.*

3. Canonical Structures

In this section we introduce an abstract notion of a *canonical structure* and we show that it corresponds, up to relabeling of the language, with being the canonical structure of a closed subgroup of $\mathfrak{S}_\mathbb{N}$. We will also talk about the relationships between different canonical structures.

3.1. Canonical Structures.

Definition 3.1. We say a structure $\mathcal{M}$ is **canonical** (for a language $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$) if

- $\mathcal{M}$ is ultrahomogeneous,
- $\mathcal{M}$ is non-redundant,
- for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and all n-tuples $\overline{a}\in\mathcal{M}$ with distinct entries there is a unique n-ary relation $R\in\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$ such that $\mathcal{M}\models R(\overline{a})$.

Lemma 3.2. *The following are equivalent for an $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$-structure $\mathcal{M}$*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is canonical,*
- *There is a relabeling $i\colon \mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \to \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})}$ such that for any relation $R\in\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$ and tuple $\boldsymbol{n}\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{M}\models R(\boldsymbol{n})$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})}\models i(R)(\boldsymbol{n})$, so $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})}$ are the same structure up to a relabeling of the language.*

Proof. It is clear that for any group G, $\mathcal{M}_G$ is canonical. In the other direction if $\mathcal{M}$ is canonical, then for any relation $R \in \mathrm{L}$ and any tuple $\overline{b}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models R(\overline{b})$, we have $\{\overline{a}\colon (\exists g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}))g\overline{a} = \overline{b}\} = \{\overline{a}\colon \mathcal{M} \models R(\overline{a})\}$ (as there is a unique relation holding of any tuple with distinct elements). □

We will use

$$R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})|_{(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})} = P$$

as shorthand for the statement

$$(\forall x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})\ [R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \to P(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})].$$

If $\mathcal{M}$ is a canonical L-structure, whenever

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})\ [R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \wedge P(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})]$$

we also have

$$\mathcal{M} \models R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})|_{(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})} = P$$

and hence for all $R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ and $(i_0, \ldots, i_{k-1}) \in n$ there is a unique $P \in \mathrm{L}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})|_{(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})} = P$. We call P the **restriction** of $R(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ to $(x_{i_0}, \ldots, x_{i_{k-1}})$.

We have a natural notion of when one canonical structure is contained in another.

Definition 3.3. If $\mathcal{M}$ is an ultrahomogeneous L-structure let $\mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M})$ be the class of all finite L-structures isomorphic to a substructure of $\mathcal{M}$.

Definition 3.4. Suppose $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1$ are canonical structures in languages $\mathrm{L}_0, \mathrm{L}_1$ respectively. We say $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{M}_1$ if

(i) $\mathrm{L}_0 \subseteq \mathrm{L}_1$.
(ii) For all $A_0 \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ there is an $A_1 \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ such that $A_0 = A_1|_{\mathrm{L}_0}$.

Note that because our structures are canonical the A_1 in condition (ii) is unique and is trivial on $\mathrm{L}_1 \setminus \mathrm{L}_0$ (i.e. $A_1 \models (\forall \overline{x})\neg R(\overline{x})$ for any $R \in \mathrm{L}_1 \setminus \mathrm{L}_0$).

An important fact about canonical structures is that if $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{M}_1$ then every measure on $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1}}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ restricts to a measure on $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_0}}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ (where $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_0}, \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1}$ are the languages of $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1$ respectively). Specifically, suppose $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mu \in \mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_1}}(\mathcal{M}_1)$. Let μ_0 the map such that whenever

- $p \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}_0}$,
- $\mathcal{M}_0 \models p(n_0, \ldots, n_{k-1})$,
- $\mathcal{M}_1 \models p(m_0, \ldots, m_{k-1})$, and
- $\eta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$ with parameters contained in $\{n_0, \ldots, n_{k-1}\}$

then $\mu_0(\eta(n_0, \ldots, n_{k-1})) = \mu(\eta(m_0, \ldots, m_{k-1}))$.

Note that as μ is $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_1)$ invariant, the value of μ_0 is independent of the specific choice of $(m_0, \ldots, m_{k-1})$, so long as the tuple satisfies p.

By Lemma 2.34 there is then a unique $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}_0)$-invariant measure extending μ_0, which we call the **restriction** of μ to $\mathcal{M}_0$ and denote $\mu|_{\mathcal{M}_0}$.

3.2. **Free Structures.** For our purposes we will be interested in a very specific type of canonical structure.

Definition 3.5. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a canonical structure. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\overline{x} := \langle x_k^n \rangle_{k \in n+1}$ be a sequence of distinct variables and for $i, j < n+1$ let $\overline{x}_i^n := \langle x_k \rangle_{k \in (n+1)\setminus\{i\}}$ and $\overline{x}_{i,j}^n := \langle x_k \rangle_{k \in (n+1)\setminus\{i,j\}}$.

We say a collection $\langle R_i(\overline{x}_i) \rangle_{i \in n+1}$ of n-ary relations is **compatible** with $\mathcal{M}$ if $\mathcal{M} \models R_i(\overline{x}_i^n)|_{\overline{x}_{i,j}^n} = R_j(\overline{x}_j^n)|_{\overline{x}_{i,j}}$ for all $i, j \in n$. We say R^* is an **extension** of $\langle R_i(\overline{x}_i) \rangle_{i \leq n+1}$ if for all $i \in n+1$, $\mathcal{M} \models R^*(\langle x_k^n \rangle_{k \in n+1})|_{\overline{x}_i^n} = R_i$.

We say that $\mathcal{M}$ is **free** if all compatible collections have an extension.

If $\mathcal{M}$ is not canonical, we say $\mathcal{M}$ is free if $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})}$ is free. A free structure can be thought of as a structure where any way of amalgamating types is consistent so long as it is locally consistent.

Example 3.6. The quintessential example of a free structure is the Rado graph, $\mathscr{R}$. The canonical structure $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\mathscr{R})}$ is the structure where

- there are two binary relations, E, the edges, and E^*, the non-edges, which are disjoint,
- for every finite graph G there is a relation R_G which holds exactly when the parameters form a graph isomorphic to G.

We also have the following example of a canonical structure which is not free.

Example 3.7. Let $\mathscr{T}$ be the triangle free random graph. The canonical structure of $\mathscr{T}$ is the structure where

- there are two binary relations, E, the edges, and E^*, the non-edges, which are disjoint,
- for every finite triangle free graph G there is a relation R_G which holds exactly when the parameters form a graph isomorphic to G.

This structure is not free as $\{E(x_0, x_1), E(x_1, x_2), E(x_2, x_0)\}$ is a compatible collection which is not the restriction of any relation in the canonical structure of $\mathscr{T}$. This is a quintessential example of how a canonical structure can fail to be free.

Even though not all canonical structures are free, every canonical structure is contained in a free canonical structure. Further we can find a minimal such free extension.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a canonical $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$-structure. Then there is a canonical structure $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ such that*

- $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ *is free,*
- $\mathcal{M} \subseteq_{can} \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$*, and*
- *whenever* $\mathcal{M} \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{N}$ *and* $\mathcal{N}$ *is free then* $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{N}$*.*

We call $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ *the* **free completion** *of* $\mathcal{M}$*.*

Proof. We define the age of $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$, as well as the language of $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$, by induction on the arity of the relations. Note we will have $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq \mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$.

Let $\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})} = \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathcal{M}}$, i.e. both languages have the same unary relations. In particular this implies $\{A\colon A \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M}) \text{ and } |A| = 1\} = \{A|_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}} \colon A \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ and $|A| = 1\}$. Let T_1 be the empty theory.

Suppose we have defined $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$ as well as all structures in $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ of size at most n. Further suppose T_n is the theory which consists of all axioms of the form $R(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = P$, for $R, P \in \mathrm{L}^{\leq n}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$, which are realized in all elements of $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ of size at most n.

Let Y_{n+1} be the set of compatible collections of size $n+1$ which are not realized in $\mathcal{M}$. Let $\mathrm{L}^{n+1}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})} = \mathrm{L}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \{P_{\overline{R}} \colon \overline{R} \in Y_{n+1}\}$ where each $P_{\overline{R}}$ is an $(n+1)$-ary relation not in $\mathrm{L}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{M}}$. Let T_{n+1} contain

- T_n.
- $R(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = P$ for all $R \in \mathrm{L}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $P \in \mathrm{L}^{\leq n}_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models R(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = P$.
- For $\overline{R} = \langle R_i(\overline{x}_i)\rangle_{i \in n+1} \in Y_{n+1}$
 - $P_{\overline{R}}(\overline{x})|_{\overline{x}_i} = R_i$.
 - $P_{\overline{R}}(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = P$ when $i \in n+1$, $\overline{y} \subseteq \overline{x}_i$ and $[R_i(\overline{x}_i)|_{\overline{y}} = P] \in T_n$.

Let $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ be the collection of finite $\mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$-structures A such that

- $A \models \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_n$
- For every tuple $\overline{a} \in A$ of distinct elements there is a unique relation $R \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$ such that $A \models R(\overline{a})$.

Claim 3.9. $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ *has the hereditary property (HP), the joint embedding property (JEP), and the strong amalgamation property (SAP).*

Proof. It is immediate that $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ has the HP and JEP. We now show it has the SAP.

Suppose $X, Y \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$. We need to show there is an element $Z \in \mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ with underlying set $X \cup Y$ which agrees with X, Y.

We will define the structure by induction on the arity of the relations.

Arity 1:
The 1-ary structure of Z is completely determined by the 1-ary structures of X and Y. Further note that any pair of elements has compatible 1-ary structure.

Arity $n+1$:

Suppose we have determined the structure of all n-tuples of Z in a way that is compatible with X and Y and such that any $(n+1)$-collection is compatible.

The structure of X and Y determines some of $(n+1)$-ary relations which must hold of Z. Choose extensions for the others arbitrarily among those compatible with the n-ary structure (note by the construction of $\mathrm{Age}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$ we can always find at least one such extension). This completely determines the $n+1$-ary structure of Z in a way that is compatible with the $(n+1)$-ary structure on X and on Y. Further, any $(n+2)$-ary tuple has compatible $(n+1)$-ary structure, and so the induction can continue.

At arity $|Z|$ we have determined all of the structure of Z (as all atomic formulas are non-redundant). □

All that is left is to show that $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ is minimal among free structures containing $\mathcal{M}$. Let $j\colon \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$ be the injection we get from the fact that $\mathcal{M} \subseteq_{can} \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$.

Suppose $\mathcal{M} \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathcal{N}$ free with the corresponding injection $i\colon \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \to \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$. We will define our injection $i\colon \mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})} \to \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ by induction.

First, as $\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathcal{M}} = \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$ we let $i(U) = j(U)$ for all $U \in \mathrm{L}^1_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})}$.

Suppose i has been defined for all relations of arity at most n and let R be a relation of arity $n+1$. If $R \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ let $i(R) = j(R)$.

If $R \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})} \setminus \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and let $\langle R_k \rangle_{k\in I}$ be the collection of restrictions of R. Note by construction $\langle i(R_k)\rangle_{k\in I}$ is compatible with $\mathcal{N}$ and so we can let $i(R)$ be any extension of $\langle i(R_k)\rangle_{k\in I}$, which we know must exist as $\mathcal{N}$ is free. Also note that as there is only one extension of $\langle R_k\rangle_{k\in I}$, i is injective and the specific choice of $i(R)$ doesn't matter so long as it is compatible with $\langle i(R_k)\rangle_{k\in I}$. □

Lemma 3.10. *If $\mathcal{M}$ is free then $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl.*

Proof. By [Hod93] Thm. 7.1.8, an ultrahomogeneous structure $\mathcal{M}$ in a relational language has trivial dcl if and only if $\mathrm{Age}(\mathcal{M})$ has strong amalgamation. But as $\mathcal{M}$ is free we must have $\mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ and by Claim 3.9 $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$ has strong amalgamation. □

An important property of free canonical structures is that each comes with a natural $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure concentrated on its isomorphism class.

Definition 3.11. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is a free canonical structure with a chosen ordering on $\mathrm{L}^n_{\mathcal{M}}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define a **uniform representation** on $\mathcal{M}$ to be a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe of the following form.

Arity 1:

Let $c_1^{\mathcal{M}}\colon [0,1]^2 \to \mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{Th}(\mathcal{M})}(x_0)$ where $c_1^{\mathcal{M}}(y,z)$ is the type containing $\gamma_{\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathcal{M}}}(z)$. Note the first coordinate is not used. This is because the measure we are defining is ergodic.

Note that as $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl, for any unary relation U there are infinitely many elements of $\mathcal{M}$ which satisfy U. Therefore $\mathscr{M}(c_1^{\mathcal{M}}) \cong \mathcal{M}|_{\mathrm{L}^1}$ a. s.

Arity $n+1$:

Assume that $\mathscr{M}(\langle c_i^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle_{i\leq n}) \cong \mathcal{M}|_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}}$ a. s.

For any collection $\overline{R} = \langle R_i(\overline{x}_i)\rangle_{i\leq n}$ compatible with $\mathcal{M}$ let $X_{\overline{R}}$ be the collection of extensions of $\overline{R}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and assume $X_{\overline{R}}$ has the order induced by that of the language. Note $X_{\overline{R}}$ is non-empty as $\mathcal{M}$ is free.

Given $\overline{x} := \langle x_i\rangle_{i\in\mathfrak{P}(n+1)}$ let $\overline{x}_i := \langle x_i\rangle_{i\in\mathfrak{P}(n+1\setminus\{i\})}$. Also let $\overline{R}^{\overline{x}} := \langle c_n^{\mathcal{M}}(\hat{\overline{x}}_i)\rangle_{i\in n+1}$. By induction $\overline{R}^{\overline{x}}$ is a. s. a compatible collection (as $\mathscr{M}(\langle c_i^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle_{i\leq n}) \cong \mathcal{M}|_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}}$). Let $Y_{n+1}(\overline{x}) = X_{\overline{R}^{\overline{x}}}$, i.e. the collection of extensions of $\overline{\mathbb{R}}^{\overline{x}}$. Let $c_{n+1}^{\mathcal{M}}(\overline{x}) = \gamma_{Y_{n+1}(\overline{x})}$.

As $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl it is easy to check that $\mathscr{M}(\langle c_i^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle_{i\leq n+1}) \cong \mathcal{M}|_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n+1}}$ a. s.

We let $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}} := \langle c_n^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and call it the **Erdős-Rényi random $\mathcal{M}$-structure** in honor of the Erdős-Rényi random graph.

The random structure $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$ can be thought of as first assigning to each element of $\mathbb{N}$ a unary relation in an i.i.d. manner. Then assigning a binary relation to every pair of elements in a manner which is i.i.d. conditioned on the unary types that were previously assigned. Then assigning to each triple a ternary relation in a manner which is i.i.d. conditioned on the binary types that were defined, etc.

Lemma 3.12. *The distribution of $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$ concentrates on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$.*

Proof. First the quantifier free types realized by $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$ are the same as those realized in $\mathcal{M}$ almost surely. Let μ be the distribution of $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$.

Suppose $\mathcal{M} \models P(\overline{x},y)|_{\overline{x}} = R$. By a back and forth argument it suffices to show that $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$ satisfies $(\forall\overline{x})R(\overline{x}) \to (\exists y)P(\overline{x},y)$ a. s. or equivalently that $\mu([\![(\forall\overline{x})R(\overline{x}) \to (\exists y)P(\overline{x},y)]\!]) = 1$.

But as μ is countably additive and $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant it therefore suffices to show $\mu([\![R(0,\ldots,k-1) \to (\exists y)P(0,\ldots,k-1,y)]\!]) = 1$ where $\mathrm{ar}(R) = k$.

Once again using countable additivity and $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariance it suffices to show $\mu([\![R(0,\ldots,k-1) \wedge P(0,\ldots,k-1,k)]\!]) > 0$. But by construction we know that $\mu([\![P(0,\ldots,k-1,k) \to R(0,\ldots,k-1)]\!]) = 1$ and therefore we have that $\mu([\![P(0,\ldots,k-1,k)]\!]) > 0$ and so we are done. □

The representations $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$ will play an important role in showing that all Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measures, for $\mathcal{M}$ free, are representable. First though we will need a little more notation.

Definition 3.13.
Arity 1: For each $U(x_0) \in \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0)$ let $S^{\mathcal{M}}_U = (c^{\mathcal{M}}_1)^{-1}(U(x_0))$. As S_U is the product of $[0,1]$ with an interval, let $\alpha_S \colon [0,1] \times [0,1] \to S_U$ be a homeomorphism which doesn't depend on the first argument such that for every set $X \subseteq S_U$, $\lambda(X)/\lambda(S_U) = \lambda(\alpha_S^{-1}(X))$.

Now suppose $p = \bigwedge_{i\in n} U_i(x_i)$ is an element of $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^1_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$. We let $S_p = \prod_{i\in n} S_{U_i} \subseteq [0,1] \times [0,1]^n$ and we let $\alpha_p \colon [0,1] \times [0,1]^n \to S_p$ be the map where $\alpha_p(y, \langle x_i\rangle_{i<n}) = \langle \alpha_{U_i(y,x_i)}\rangle_{i<n}$.

Arity $n+1$:
Assume for all $p \in \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ we have defined

$$S_p := \{\overline{x} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\leq n}(k) \colon (\exists \overline{y}) \mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) \models p(0, \dots, k-1)\}$$

and that $\alpha_p \colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{\leq n}(k)} \to S_p$ is a bijection.

Let $p \in \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n+1}_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ and let p^- be the restriction of p to the collection of types in $\mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$. Let $S_p = (c^{\mathcal{M}}_{n+1})^{-1}(p(\overline{x}))$. Then because of how $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$ was defined we know that $S_p = S_{p^-} \times I$ where I is a subinterval of $[0,1]$. Let $i \colon [0,1] \to I$ be an isomorphism such that for every set $X \subseteq I$, $\lambda(X)/\lambda(I) = \lambda(i^{-1}(X))$. Let $\alpha_p = \alpha_{p^-} \times i$.

We then extend the definition of S_p and the definition of α_p to the case where $p \in \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n+1}_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1})$ and $k > n+1$ in the obvious way.

Note that for each $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$ the following holds

- If $X \subseteq S_p$ then $\lambda(X)/\lambda(S_p) = \lambda(\alpha_p^{-1}(X))$.
- For any $n_0 < n$ if q_{n_0} is the restriction of p to $\mathrm{L}^{\leq n_0}_{\mathcal{M}}$ then $S_p = S_q \times I_{p,q}$ where $I_{p,q}$ is the product of intervals. Further α_p restricts to α_q on S_q.

4. Merging of Measures

One of the most important observations of this paper is that if $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$ then for every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$ and every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure we can combine them in a unique way to get an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure which *agrees* with both. Further every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$ is of this form.

In particular, when $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^*$ are structures (not necessarily in the same language) with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$, and where $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl, we will be able reduce the question of "when is there an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}^*}}(\mathcal{M})$ which concentrates on $\sigma_{\mathcal{M}^*}$?" to the question of "when is there an $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure which concentrates on $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{M}^*$?", a question which has been completely answered by Ackerman, Freer and Patel in [AFP].

Further we will be able to use this method of combining measures to show that when $\mathcal{M}$ is free every $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure can be combined with the distribution of the Erdős-Rényi random $\mathcal{M}$-structure to get a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure from whose representation we can extract a representation for the $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure we started with.

Suppose

- $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are canonical structures with underlying set $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$.
- $\nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}}(\mathcal{N})$ which is concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$.
- μ is an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$.

Let $\mathbb{B}(\mathcal{M}, \mathrm{L})$ be the collection of sets which are of the form

$$[\![p(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}) \wedge \varphi(n_{i_0}, \dots, n_{i_{j-1}})]\!]$$

where

- $p \in \mathrm{L}^k_{\mathcal{M}}$, and
- $\varphi(n_{i_0}, \dots, n_{i_{j-1}}) \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$.

Suppose

- $[\![p(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}) \wedge \varphi(n_{i_0}, \dots, n_{i_{j-1}})]\!] \in \mathbb{B}(\mathcal{M}, \mathrm{L})$,
- $\mathcal{M} \models p(r_0, \dots, r_{k-1})$,
- $\mathcal{N} \models q(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1})$ where $\mathcal{M} \models (\forall \overline{x})\ p(\overline{x}) \to q(\overline{x})$.

Let

$$\mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1}) \wedge \varphi(n_{i_0}, \dots, n_{i_{\ell-1}})]\!]) := \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p(n_0, \dots, n_{k-1})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) \cdot \mu([\![\varphi(r_{i_0}, \dots, r_{i_{\ell-1}})]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}).$$

Proposition 4.1. *$\mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ extends uniquely to a $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure, $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$, on $\mathscr{S}^*_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{N})$ such that*

(i) *$\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) = \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}})$ for all $p \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{N}$.*

(ii) *$\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![\eta(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) = \mu([\![\eta(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})$ for all $\eta(\boldsymbol{n}) \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$ and $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Clearly any extension of $\mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ to a $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure will satisfy (i) and (ii) and each $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure satisfying (i) and (ii) extends $\mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. It therefore suffices to show that there is a unique such extension. We will do this by showing that there is a unique extension to a map $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$ which satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.34.

Suppose $\eta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$. Then $\eta = \zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1 \wedge \zeta_2$ for some $\zeta_0 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}})$, $\zeta_1 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$ and $\zeta_2 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}})$.

If $\mathcal{N} \models \zeta_2$ let $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\eta) = \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1)$. Otherwise let $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\eta) = 0$. In particular this implies that $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ satisfies Lemma 2.34 condition (a) and condition (b) for atomic formulas from $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$.

Now assume $\mathcal{N} \models \zeta_2$. Let $\overline{a}$ be the union of the parameters from $\zeta_1 \cup \zeta_0$ and let $q = R(\overline{a})$ where $R \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is the unique relation which holds of $\overline{a}$ (under some fixed ordering). Let $X_{\zeta_0} := \{P \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \colon \mathcal{M} \models (\exists \overline{x}) P(\overline{x}) \wedge R(\overline{x}) \wedge \zeta_0(\overline{y})$, where $\overline{y}$ sits in $\overline{x}$ as the parameters of ζ_0 sit in $\overline{a}\}$. If X_{ζ_0} is empty then let $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\eta) = 0$.

If $X_{\zeta_0} \neq \emptyset$ then let $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\eta) = \sum_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} \mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p \wedge \zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{N}})$.

Note that

$$\sum_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} \mu \boxplus^\dagger \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p \wedge \zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) = \left(\sum_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) \right) \cdot \mu([\![\zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})$$

but as $\{[\![p]\!] \colon p \in X_{\zeta_0}\}$ are disjoint this sum equals

$$\nu_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\left[\!\!\left[\bigvee_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} p \right]\!\!\right]_{\mathcal{N}} \right) \cdot \mu([\![\zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}).$$

In particular this implies the range of $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a subset of $[0, 1]$.

We now must show Lemma 2.34 condition (b) is satisfied for atomic formulas from $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}$.

Suppose $R \in \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$. For $p \in X_{\zeta_0}$, if $\mathcal{M} \models p(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = R$ and $\overline{b}$ sits in $\overline{a}$ as $\overline{y}$ sits in $\overline{x}$ then

$$\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((p(\overline{a}) \wedge R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1) = \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p(\overline{a}) \wedge \zeta_1)$$

and $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((p(\overline{a}) \wedge \neg R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1) = 0$. Similarly if $\mathcal{M} \models p(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} \neq R$ then $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((p(\overline{a}) \wedge \neg R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1) = \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p(\overline{a}) \wedge \zeta_1)$ and $\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((p(\overline{a}) \wedge R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1) = 0$.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1) &= \sum_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p \wedge \zeta_1) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\substack{p \in X_{\zeta_0} \\ p(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} = R(\overline{y})}} \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p \wedge \zeta_1) \right) + \left(\sum_{\substack{p \in X_{\zeta_0} \\ p(\overline{x})|_{\overline{y}} \neq R(\overline{y})}} \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p \wedge \zeta_1) \right) \\
&= \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((\zeta_0 \wedge R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1) + \mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}((\zeta_0 \wedge \neg R(\overline{b})) \wedge \zeta_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose $\beta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$. We have

$$\mu \boxplus^- \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\zeta_0 \wedge (\zeta_1 \wedge \beta)) = \nu_{\mathcal{M}} \left(\left[\!\!\left[\bigvee_{p \in X_{\zeta_0}} p \right]\!\!\right] \right) \cdot \mu([\![\zeta_1 \wedge \beta]\!])$$

and so if β is an atomic formula

$$\mu \boxplus^{-} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(\zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1) = \mu \boxplus^{-} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p \wedge (\zeta_1 \wedge \beta)) + \mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}(p \wedge (\zeta_1 \wedge \neg\beta)).$$

We therefore have, by Lemma 2.34, that there is a unique measure, $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$, extending $\mu \boxplus^{-} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. Further, as $\mu \boxplus^{-} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant so is $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Finally it is also immediate that $\mu \boxplus^{-} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the unique extension of $\mu \boxplus^{\dagger} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ which preserves additivity of the measure and hence satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.34. □

It turns out that $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![\eta(\mathbf{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}})$ has a particularly nice description whenever $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}} \cup \mathrm{L})$. For $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{N}} \cup \mathrm{L})$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{N})$ with $\mathcal{N} \models q(\mathbf{n})$ and $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$ with $\mathcal{M} \models (\forall \overline{x}) p(\overline{x}) \to q(\overline{x})$ define $\mu^p([\![\eta(\mathbf{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}) = \mu([\![\eta(\mathbf{n}^*)]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})$ where $\mathcal{M} \models p(\mathbf{n}^*)$.

Proposition 4.2. *We have*

$$\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![\eta(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]) = \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}) \\ \mathcal{M} \models (\forall \overline{x}) p(\overline{x}) \to q(\overline{x})}} \nu_{\mathcal{M}}([\![p(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]) \cdot \mu^p([\![\eta(\boldsymbol{n})]\!]_{\mathcal{N}})$$

Proof. Let A be a fragment containing η. As Th_A is interdefinable with the empty theory in $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ there is a unique measure μ_A which agrees with μ on L and a unique measure which agrees with $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathrm{L} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$. But then $\mu_A \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ agrees with $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ on $\mathrm{L} \cup \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and hence it must be that measure. But the proposition holds for $\mu_A \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ as η is equivalent to a quantifier free formula. Therefore the proposition must also hold of $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. □

We have now shown how we can uniquely recover an Aut($\mathcal{N}$)-invariant measure from an Aut($\mathcal{N}$)-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$ along with an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure. We next show that every Aut($\mathcal{N}$)-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$ must have such a (necessarily unique) decomposition.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose η is an* Aut($\mathcal{N}$)*-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{N})$ concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$. There exists unique measures μ^η and $\nu^\eta_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that*

- *μ^η is an* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$,*
- *$\nu^\eta_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an* Aut($\mathcal{N}$)*-invariant measure on $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}}(\mathcal{N})$ concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$,*
- *$\eta = \mu^\eta \boxplus \nu^\eta_{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. First notice that if μ^η and $\nu^\eta_{\mathcal{M}}$ exist they must agree with η on their respective domains and hence are uniquely determined by η.

By Lemma 2.34 to define μ^η it suffices to define it on $\mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} \cup \mathrm{L})$. In particular suppose $\zeta_0 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}})$ and $\zeta_1 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$. We let $\mu^\eta([\![\zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) = \eta([\![\zeta_0 \to \zeta_1]\!]_{\mathcal{N}})$ if $\mathcal{M} \models \zeta_0$ and 0 otherwise. It is then easily checked that the

conditions of Lemma 2.34 are satisfied so that this partial definition of μ^η extends uniquely to an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$-invariant measure.

Similarly by Lemma 2.34 to define $\nu_\mathcal{M}$ it suffices to define it on $\mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{N} \cup \mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M})$. In particular suppose $\zeta_0 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M})$ and $\zeta_1 \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{N})$. We let $\nu^\eta_\mathcal{M}([\![\zeta_0 \wedge \zeta_1]\!]_\mathcal{N}) = \eta([\![\zeta_0]\!]_\mathcal{N})$ if $\mathcal{N} \models \zeta_1$ and 0 otherwise. It is then easily checked that the conditions of Lemma 2.34 are satisfied so that this partial definition of $\nu^\eta_\mathcal{M}$ extends uniquely to an $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$-invariant measure.

But we have that η and $\mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M}$ agree on the domains of μ and $\nu_\mathcal{M}$ and so by Proposition 4.1 we have $\eta = \mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M}$. □

Putting these pieces together we will obtain several key results.

4.1. **Consequences.** The following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$, $\nu_\mathcal{M}$ *is an* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{N})$ *invariant measure concentrated on* $[\![\sigma_\mathcal{M}]\!]_\mathcal{N}$ *and* μ *is an* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$*-invariant measure* μ *on* $\mathscr{S}_\mathrm{L}(\mathcal{M})$. *Then* $Th(\mu) = Th(\mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L})$.

Proof. For τ a sentence in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}(\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M} \cup \mathrm{L})$ let $\tau^=(x) := \tau \wedge (x = x)$ be a unary formula. Note $\tau \in \mathrm{Th}(\beta)$ for any measure if and only if $\beta([\![\tau^=(0)]\!]) = 1$.

By Proposition 4.2 we have

$$\mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M}([\![\tau^=(0)]\!]) = \sum_{\substack{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}) \\ \mathcal{M} \models (\forall x) p(x) \to q(x) \\ \mathcal{N} \models q(0)}} \nu_\mathcal{M}([\![p(0)]\!]) \cdot \mu^p([\![\tau^=(0)]\!]_\mathcal{N})$$

but

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}) \\ \mathcal{M} \models (\forall x) p(x) \to q(x) \\ \mathcal{N} \models q(0)}} \nu_\mathcal{M}([\![p(0)]\!]) = 1$$

by construction and so

$$\mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M}([\![\tau^=(0)]\!]) = 1 \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_{\substack{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}) \\ \mathcal{M} \models (\forall x) p(x) \to q(x) \\ \mathcal{N} \models q(0)}} [\mu^p([\![\tau^=(0)]\!]_\mathcal{N}) = 1]$$

Hence $\tau \in \mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ if and only if $\tau \in \mathrm{Th}(\mu \boxplus \nu_\mathcal{M})$. □

In particular we have the following easy corollary of Theorem 2.40 and Proposition 4.4.

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose* $\mathcal{N}$ *has trivial dcl with* $\mathrm{L}_\mathcal{N} \subseteq \mathrm{L}_\mathcal{M}$ *and* $\mathcal{M}|_\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}$. *Then the following are equivalent*

(a) $\mathcal{M}$ *has trivial dcl*
(b) *There is an* Aut($\mathcal{N}$)*-invariant measure on* $\mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{N})$ *which concentrates on the isomorphism class of* $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Suppose (a) holds. Then there is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure β concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$. Further, by Proposition 4.3 there is therefore an Aut($\mathcal{N}$)-invariant measure μ such that $\beta = \mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{N}}$ for some $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure $\nu_{\mathcal{N}}$. But by Proposition 4.4 we have $\mathrm{Th}(\beta) = \mathrm{Th}(\mu)$ and so μ must concentrate on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$ and so (b) holds.

Now suppose (b) holds and μ is an Aut($\mathcal{N}$)-invariant measure concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]_{\mathcal{N}}$. Then as $\mathcal{N}$ has trivial dcl by Theorem 2.40 there is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure $\nu_{\mathcal{N}}$ concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{N}}]\!]$. But by Proposition 4.1 $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure and by Proposition 4.4 $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{N}}$ concentrates on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$. But then by Theorem 2.40 we know $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl and (a) holds. □

Theorem 2.40 can be thought of as saying that a structure $\mathcal{M}$ with underlying sets $\mathbb{N}$ can be constructed in a random manner without making use of the implicit ordering on $\mathbb{N}$ if and only if $\mathcal{M}$ has trivial dcl. Proposition 4.5 can be seen to say that even if we give the random construction access to a structure $\mathcal{N}$ on $\mathbb{N}$, provided $\mathcal{N}$ has trivial dcl, no new structures $\mathcal{M}$ can be randomly constructed in this way.

5. Representations

In this section we finally show that an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure has a representation if and only if it is the restriction of an Aut($\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M})$)-measure.

5.1. Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-Recipes.

We now introduce Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipes, which are the direct generalizations of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipes in Definition 2.36. In the following definition we assume $\mathcal{M}$ is canonical.

Definition 5.1. An **Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe** on L is a collection of measurable functions $\overline{f} = \langle f_p \rangle_{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})}$ where $f_p \colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to \mathrm{otp}_{\mathrm{L}^n}(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1})$ when $\mathrm{ar}(p) = n$.

If $\overline{f} = \langle f_p \rangle_{p \in \mathrm{ntp}(\mathcal{M})}$ is an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe let $\mathscr{M}(\overline{f}) \colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})} \to \mathscr{S}_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathcal{M})$ be a function such that

- for any relation $R \in \mathrm{L}$ of arity k,
- $\overline{y} = \langle y_{\overline{b}} \rangle_{\overline{b} \in \mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})} \in [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$,
- and $\overline{a} = (a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{[<\omega]}$ with $\mathcal{M} \models p_{\overline{a}}(\overline{a})$ for $p_{\overline{a}} \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$.

$\mathscr{M}(\overline{f})(\overline{y}) \models R(a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1})$ if and only if $R(x_0, \ldots, x_{k-1}) \in f_{p_{\overline{a}}}(\hat{y}_{\overline{a}})$

An Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe is similar to a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe except in the construction of the random structure we are allowed use the type of the elements in $\mathcal{M}$. In particular every Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe gives rise to an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose $\overline{f} = \langle f_p \rangle_{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})}$ is an* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-recipe. If $\mu_{\overline{f}}$ is the distribution of $\mathscr{M}(\overline{f})$ with respect to λ on $[0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}_{<\omega}(\mathbb{N})}$ then $\mu_{\overline{f}}$ is* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-invariant.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that if $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$ satisfying the same quantifier free type, p, and $\zeta \in \mathrm{qf}_\pi(\mathrm{L})$ then $\mu_{\overline{f}}([\![\zeta(\overline{a})]\!]_{\mathcal{M}}) = \lambda(f_p^{-1}(\zeta(\overline{x}))) = \mu_{\overline{f}}([\![\zeta(\overline{b})]\!]_{\mathcal{M}})$. □

We will be interested in distributions of Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipes.

Definition 5.3. We say an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure μ is **representable** if there is an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe $\overline{f}$ such that $\mu = \mu_{\overline{f}}$. In this case we say $\overline{f}$ is a **representation** of μ.

Now an important fact is the following.

Proposition 5.4. *Suppose $\overline{f}$ is an* Aut($\mathcal{M}_0$)*-recipe on* L *and $\mathcal{M}_0 \subseteq_{can} \mathcal{M}_1$. Then there is an* Aut($\mathcal{M}_1$)*-recipe on $\overline{g}$ on* L *such that $g_p = f_p$ whenever $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}_0)$.*

Proof. For $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}_1)$, if $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}_0)$ let $g_p = f_p$. Otherwise let g_p be the constant function which takes the value of the trivial type, i.e. the type $\{\neg R(\overline{x}) \colon R \in \mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{ar}(p)}\}$. □

In particular Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 5.4 imply that any representable measure is the restriction of a measure which is invariant under Aut($\mathcal{M}$) where $\mathcal{M}$ is free. We will next see that the converse holds as well and every measure which is Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant for $\mathcal{M}$ free has a representation.

5.2. **Representability and Free Structures.** We now show that whenever $\mathcal{M}$ is free, every Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-invariant measure is representable.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is free and μ is an* Aut($\mathcal{M}$)*-invariant measure. Then μ is representable.*

Proof. Recall $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$ from Definition 3.11 is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe such that $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$ is concentrated on $[\![\sigma_{\mathcal{M}}]\!]$. Call its distribution $\nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. Also recall the definitions of S_p and α_p (for $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$) from Definition 3.13.

By Proposition 4.1 we know that $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant measure.

Now by construction, for every $p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$, α_p is a bijection from $[0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{ar}(p))}$ to S_p. Therefore if we can find a representation $\overline{e}$ of $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ which agrees with

$\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$ then $\overline{f} := \langle e_p \circ \alpha_p \rangle_{p \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})}$ is an Aut($\mathcal{M}$)-recipe which is a representation of μ.

As $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ is $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-invariant we know that there is a $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$-recipe $\overline{g}$ which represents it. Let $\overline{g}^*$ be the restriction of $\overline{g}$ to the language $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$. As $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ restricted to $\mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}}$ has the same distribution as $\nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ we have that $\mathscr{M}(\overline{g}^*)$ has the same distribution as $\mathscr{M}(\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}})$, i.e. $\nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. So, by Theorem 2.39, there are maps $h^{\overline{c}}_n, h^{\overline{g}}_n \colon [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n)} \to [0,1]$ such that

- $h^{\overline{c}}_n, h^{\overline{g}}_n$ preserve λ in the highest order arguments, and
- $c^{\mathcal{M}}_n \circ \widehat{h^{\overline{f}}_n} = \overline{g}^* \circ \widehat{h^{\overline{g}}_n}$ a. s.

But, by Theorem 2.39 $\langle g_n \circ \widehat{h^{\overline{g}}_n} \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is also a representation of $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$. We can therefore assume without loss of generality that $g_n = c^{\mathcal{M}}_n \circ \widehat{h^{\overline{c}}_n}$ a. s.

Claim 5.6. *There is a representation $\overline{e} = \langle e_n \rangle_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\mu \boxplus \nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ which agrees with $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. We define e_n by induction.

Arity 1:
For each $U \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M})$ of arity 1 let $P_U = (h^{\overline{c}}_1)^{-1}(S_U)$. By construction of $\nu_{\mathcal{M}}$ we know that $|P_U| = 2^\omega$ and that P_U is Borel with $\lambda(P_U) = \lambda(S_U)$. So there is a measure preserving isomorphism $\beta_U \colon S_U \to P_U$. Let $e_1 \colon S_U \to \mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}}(x_0)$ be such that $e_1(a) = g_1 \circ \beta_U(a)$ whenever $a \in S_U$. Clearly $\mathscr{M}(g_1)$ and $\mathscr{M}(e_1)$ have the same distribution.

Arity $n+1$:
Assume we have defined e_n and for each $p \in \mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}^{\leq n}}(x_0, \dots, x_{\mathrm{ar}(p)-1})$ we have defined $P_p = (h^{\overline{c}}_n)^{-1}(S_p)$. Further suppose we have define a measure preserving bijection $\beta_p \colon S_p \to P_p$ such that $e_n = g_n \circ \beta_p$ on S_p.

Now suppose $p \in \mathrm{ntp}_{\mathrm{L}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{M}}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$ and p^- is the restriction of p to n-ary types. Let $X_{p^-} = \{p^* \in \mathrm{qtp}(\mathcal{M}) \colon p^* \text{ restricts to } p^-\}$.

Suppose $\overline{x} \in [0,1]^{\mathfrak{P}(n) \setminus \{\{0,\dots,n-1\}\}}$ and $y \in [0,1]$. As $g_{n+1}(\overline{x}, y) \cap \mathrm{L}_{\mathcal{M}} = c^{\mathcal{M}}_{n+1} \circ (\widehat{h^{\overline{c}}_{n+1}})(\overline{x}, y)$ we must have

$$\begin{aligned}(\overline{x}, y) \in \bigcup_{p^* \in X_{p^-}} P_{p^*} &\Leftrightarrow (\widehat{h^{\overline{c}}_{n+1}})(\overline{x}, y) \in \bigcup_{p^* \in X_{p^-}} S_p \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\widehat{h^{\overline{c}}_n})(\overline{x}) \in S_{p^-} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \overline{x} \in P_{p^-}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\bigcup_{p^* \in X_{p^-}} P_{p^*} = P_{p^-} \times [0,1]$.

But we also have that a. s. for all $\overline{x} \in P_{p^-}$ and all $p \in X_{p^-}$ that $\lambda(\{y\colon (\overline{x}, y) \in P_p\}) = \lambda(\{y\colon \gamma_{X_{p^-}}(y) = p\})$ and hence does not depend on $\overline{x}$. For each $p \in X_{p^-}$ there is therefore a measure preserving isomorphism $i_p\colon P_{p^-} \times \{y\colon \gamma_{X_{p^-}}(y) = p\} \to P_p$.

But we know by induction that there is a measure preserving isomorphism $\beta_p\colon S_{p^-} \to P_{p^-}$ such that $e_{\mathrm{ar}(p^-)} = g_{\mathrm{ar}(p^-)} \circ \beta_{p^-}$. So if we let $\beta_p = \beta_{p^-} \times i_p$ then β_p is a measure preserving isomorphism from S_p to P_p. We then let $e_{n+1}(\overline{x}) = g_{n+1} \circ \beta_p(\overline{x})$ whenever $\overline{x} \in S_p$.

It is then immediate that $\overline{e}$ agrees with $\overline{c}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and we are done. □

This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 5.7. *The following are equivalent for an* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$*-invariant measure* μ*.*

(a) μ *is representable.*

(b) *There is an* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{M}))$*-invariant measure* $\mathfrak{F}(\mu)$ *such that* $\mu = \mathfrak{F}(\mu)|_{\mathcal{M}}$*.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 5.5. □

Condition (b) from Theorem 5.7 can be thought of as being an amalgamation condition on the measure, i.e. it says that any locally consistent properties of the measure can be amalgamated into a measure where they are globally consistent.

6. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Cameron Freer and Rehana Patel for many helpful conversations as well as Cameron Freer for comments on an early draft. I would also like to thank Todor Tsankov for posing the a question which is answered in Proposition 4.5.

This research was facilitated by participation in the London Mathematical Society – EPSRC Durham Symposium on "Permutation Groups and Transformation Semigroups" from July 20-30, 2015 (Durham, England) as well as the "Logic and Random Graphs" workshop at the Lorentz Center in from August 31 - September 4, 2015 (Leiden, Netherlands).

References

[AFP] N. Ackerman, C. Freer, and R. Patel. *Invariant measures concentrated on countable structures.* arXiv:math/1206.4011.

[Aus08] T. Austin. "On exchangeable random variables and the statistics of large graphs and hypergraphs". In: *Probab. Surv.* 5 (2008), pp. 80–145. ISSN: 1549-5787.

[Bar75] J. Barwise. *Admissible sets and structures*. An approach to definability theory, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975, pp. xiii+394.

[BK96] H. Becker and A. S. Kechris. *The descriptive set theory of Polish group actions*. Vol. 232. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, pp. xii+136. ISBN: 0-521-57605-9.

[Hod93] W. Hodges. *Model theory*. Vol. 42. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. xiv+772. ISBN: 0-521-30442-3.

[Kal02] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Second. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002, pp. xx+638. ISBN: 0-387-95313-2.

[Kal05] O. Kallenberg. *Probabilistic symmetries and invariance principles*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, New York, 2005, pp. xii+510. ISBN: 978-0387-25115-8; 0-387-25115-4.

[Kec95] A. S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*. Vol. 156. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995, pp. xviii+402. ISBN: 0-387-94374-9.

Department of Mathematics, Harvard University, One Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

E-mail address: nate@math.harvard.edu